

Appl. No. 09/932,085
Final Amendment and Response
Reply to final Office action of March 30, 2004

Page 6 of 8

REMARKS / DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

Claims 1-12 are pending in the application.

Favorable reconsideration of this application is requested in view of the following remarks. For the reasons set forth below, Applicant respectfully submits that the claimed invention is allowable over the cited references.

The final Office Action dated March 30, 2004, indicated that the drawings are objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a); claim 7 is objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(a); claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over *Weber et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 4,866,349) and further in view of Lo (U.S. Patent No. 6,483,490); and claims 6-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Moon (U.S. Patent No. 6,111,556), and further in view of Lo.

With respect to the drawings, the Office Action suggests that a waveform of the voltage having "a periodically changing polarity" is not shown in Fig. 3. Such a waveform is not claimed and therefore not required for illustration in the drawings. Notwithstanding, Applicant refers to Figure 4 and the related discussion (at pages 9-10) of the voltage VL1 which defines the voltage at node N_c of Figure 3. Accordingly, the claimed aspect is fully illustrated and described.

Regarding the objection to claim 7, Applicant has amended claim 7 for nonstatutory reasons. Accordingly, the amendment is merely to improve readability. Applicant therefore submits that the objection to claim 7 is overcome.

Applicant respectfully traverses each of the Section 103(a) rejections because the proposed combinations fail to correspond to the claimed invention. The Office Action acknowledges that the '349 and '556 references fail to correspond to the claimed invention and therefore relies upon the teachings of the '490 reference to supplement the deficient '349 and '556 teachings. The Office Action erroneously asserts that the '490 reference teaches circulating a current through an inductor in a loop formed by a switch circuit. However, the asserted '490 loop includes a capacitor C1 that would inhibit the circulation of current in the alleged loop. The cited portion of the '490 reference merely discusses current flow that charges the capacitor and not

Atty. Docket No. NL 000460

Appl. No. 09/932,085
Final Amendment and Response
Reply to final Office action of March 30, 2004

Page 7 of 8

current that circulates through any loop. Moreover, the Office Action fails to show how the '490 current switch (or combined art) would switch polarity at the end of a resonant cycle and how a resonant period ends when the current changes polarity, as claimed by Applicant. Rather than supporting the interpretation provided in the Office Action, the relevant portions of the '490 reference are directed to routing current in different directions without any switching of polarity. See, e.g., column 6, lines 51-55. Without a presentation of correspondence to each of the claimed limitations, the Section 103(a) rejections cannot be maintained and Applicant accordingly requests that they be withdrawn.

Further, the Office Action fails to present evidence of motivation to form the proposed combinations. The Office Action suggests that the skilled artisan would insert the '490 switch circuit into the '349 and '556 systems to improve luminous efficiency of a display device. The Office Action fails to indicate how and where this switch circuit would be inserted into each of the systems. Moreover, it is not clear from the Office Action that the controls needed to effect modified '349 and '556 systems would be present or operable. See MPEP § 2143.01. As such, there would be no motivation for the proposed modification. Absent such evidence of motivation, the Section 103(a) rejection is improper and cannot be maintained. Applicant accordingly requests that the rejections be withdrawn.

Applicant has added new claims 10-12 to further characterize the instant invention as directed to the switch circuit of claims 1, 5, and 6, by the loop formed by said switch circuit not passing current through a capacitor. The additional claims do not add new matter and should be patentable over the prior art because the cited prior art does not teach this subject matter of claims 1, 5 and 6.

Atty. Docket No. NL 000460

Appl. No. 09/932,085
Final Amendment and Response
Reply to final Office action of March 30, 2004

Page 8 of 8

In view of the remarks above, Applicant believes that each of the rejections has been overcome and the application is in condition for allowance. Should there be any remaining issues that could be addressed over the telephone, the Examiner is asked to contact the agent overseeing the application file, Mr. Eric Bram, of Philips Corporation at (914) 945-6000.

Please direct all correspondence to:

Corporate Patent Counsel
Philips Intellectual Property & Standards
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510

By: 

Name: Robert J. Crawford
Reg. No.: 32,122
(PENA.031PA)

Atty. Docket No. NL 000460